

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NADIA JALAL THOMPSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
TRIDENT SEAFOODS CORP., *et al.*,
Defendants.

No. C11-0120RSL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINE

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff’s “Motion to Amend Discovery Completed Date.” Dkt. # 23. The motion is DENIED. Plaintiff was not diligent in initiating or pursuing discovery in this matter and was previously advised that “failure to complete discovery within the time allowed is not recognized as good cause” for an extension of the case management deadlines. Dkt. # 8 at 2. It also appears that, when plaintiff finally attempted to schedule depositions at the end of December, defendants were able to produce the four witnesses within their control prior to the original discovery deadline.

In her reply memorandum, plaintiff suggests that she needs additional time in which to conduct discovery regarding a new claim that she asserted on December 20, 2011. Defendants did not have an opportunity to respond to this argument, and it is therefore rejected on that ground. In addition, plaintiff's recent amendment to her complaint does not comply with the Court's specific instruction that her claims must be stated in a single document and not in a

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO EXTEND DISCOVERY DEADLINE**

1 series of piecemeal, incomplete filings. Dkt. # 13. Plaintiff clearly intends to pursue her sexual
2 discrimination, hostile work environment, and retaliation claims against defendants and yet fails
3 to include them in her one-page “Amend and Add to Complaint.” Dkt. # 20. Because the new
4 claim was not properly asserted, the Court declines to rework the case management schedule
5 around it.

6 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff’s motion to extend the discovery deadline
7 (Dkt. # 23) is DENIED.

8
9 Dated this 31st day of January, 2012.

10 
11 Robert S. Lasnik
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26